

**United States Environmental Protection Agency  
Criminal Investigation Division  
Investigative Activity Report**

**Case Number:**

0303-M431

**Case Title:**

Manassas Battlefield Park

**Subject of Report:**

(b) (6), (b) Interview

**Reporting Office:**

Washington, DC, Resident Office

**Activity Date:**

April 5, 2017

**Reporting Official and Date:**

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Special Agent

02-MAY-2017, Signed by: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

**Approving Official and Date:**

(b) (6), (b) (7)

Acting Special Agent in Charge

25-MAY-2017, Approved by: (b) (6), (b)

Acting Special Agent in Charge

**SYNOPSIS**

On April 5, 2017, Special Agent (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) Environmental Protection Agency, Criminal Investigation Division (EPA-CID) and (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) U.S. Park Police (USPP) interviewed (b) (6), (b) (7) at the Manassas Battlefield Park in Manassas, Virginia. (b) (6), (b) (7) provided information regarding the asbestos tile removal at the park in 2013.

**DETAILS**

On April 5, 2017, SA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) EPA-CID, and (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) USPP, interviewed (b) (6), (b) (7) at the Manassas Battlefield Park in Manassas, Virginia. Agents identified themselves and explained the nature of the interview. (b) (6), (b) (7) voluntarily agreed to speak with agents and provided the following information. This narrative is a summary of the interview and is not verbatim unless otherwise noted.

(b) (6), (b) (7) currently works for the National Park Service (NPS) as a (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) at Wolf Trap Park. He was formerly the grounds, roads and trails supervisor at Manassas Battlefield Park from 2008 to 2015. From 2012 to November 2015, he worked under the facilities department (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) at Manassas. (b) (6), (b) (7) stated that (b) (6), (b) (7) was "the worst ever". (b) (6), (b) (7) had an attitude that things had to be done his way and he was always right. (b) (6), (b) (7) recalled there was an unspoken rule that if you argued with (b) (6), (b) (7) he would give you a bad reassignment. (b) (6), (b) (7) explained he left Manassas because he did not want to deal with (b) (6), (b) (7).

(b) (6), (b) (7) believed that (b) (6), (b) (7) was in trouble with NPS for something else where he was coercing employees to do split purchases. (b) (6), (b) (7) commented that (b) (6), (b) (7) had mental issues and had an 80% disability from the V.A. (b) (6), (b) (7) was a (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) and had a background in accounting. (b) (6), (b) (7) has a similar background in the Marines and saw (b) (6), (b) (7) anger issues on a daily basis. On one occasion (b) (6), (b) (7) smacked (b) (6), (b) (7) in the head. (b) (6), (b) (7) has a written statement regarding this issue.

(b) (6), (b) (7) did not like to be corrected and one could not challenge his authority. On one occasion he yelled at (b) (6), (b) (7) in front of park visitors during a digging project. On another occasion during the winter of 2013, he argued with (b) (6), (b) (7) about frostbite on (b) (6), (b) (7) foot. (b) (6), (b) (7) later went to the doctor and had frostbite. There was an SMIS report completed for this incident.

(b) (6), (b) (7) explained in July 2013 there was flooding in the basement of the visitor center. The maintenance department had to redo the floors. (b) (6), (b) (7) came into work on that Friday and was in charge of programming work for the YCC (Youth Conservation Corps). (b) (6), (b) (7) had taken off on leave.

The following Monday, (b) (6), (b) (7) raised concerns about removing the floor tile because it might contain asbestos and he did not want to work with it. (b) (6), (b) (7) was not aware of any asbestos involved in the project.

This document contains neither recommendations nor conclusions of the EPA.  
It is the property of the EPA and is loaned to your agency;  
it and its contents are not to be distributed outside your agency.

**United States Environmental Protection Agency  
Criminal Investigation Division  
Investigative Activity Report**

**Case Number:**

0303-M431

and nobody told him the tiles might contain asbestos.

The park superintendent, (b) (6), called later that day and was asking why the YCC kids were working on this project. (b) (6), (b) (7) had reportedly contacted (b) (6), (b) , the regional safety officer, about the project who then called (b) .

The workers were “tearing things up” and (b) asked (b) (6), (b) about the work. (b) (6), (b) reportedly told (b) that the tiles were not friable and said “don’t put fingers in your mouth”.

(b) explained the workers used shovels and were breaking apart the tiles. There was a shop vacuum with no filter, and there was “dust everywhere”. (b) was not present during the work but was told about the work by the NPS employees who were there.

NPS employees who worked on the project included 4 or 5 YCC workers who were 16 to 18 years old, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), and (b) (6), (b) (7)(C).

(b) (6), (b) reportedly told (b) that he talked to (b) (6), (b) , safety officer, about the project, who was “ok with it”. One week later, (b) (6), shut down the visitor center and took air samples. The samples reportedly came back low with 2% asbestos. (b) (6), reportedly commented to (b) that management got off lucky because of the low levels.

(b) explained he called (b) (6), (b) the day that the superintendent called about the work. (b) (6), (b) was on leave and asked (b) if he needed to come back in. (b) (6), (b) also asked (b) who raised the issue and who told the superintendent. (b) (6), (b) came back to work the following week.

(b) was later told that NPS management had discussed the potential for asbestos to be in the tiles during management meetings. (b) (6), (b) also later told (b) that the tiles could possibly be asbestos and he knew this based on his training. (b) (6), (b) further told (b) that the tiles were not friable because they were just snapping and were not breaking into a powdery substance.

(b) explained the waste from this project went into a 30-yard container that was on-site. The tiles were placed in bags and then put in the container. The container was open and contained construction debris. (b) did not know who owned or transported the container but that it was a contractor. NPS employee (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) handles contracting and would know who owns the container. The container may have gone to a local landfill for disposal.

(b) did not know if workers wore any personal protective equipment during the job. He believed that they used shovels and scrapers to remove the tiles. Most of the tiles popped up, but some broke apart and were brittle.

(b) estimated the project area to be 12 x 23 feet, and estimated at least 20 bags of tiles were thrown into the dumpsters, as well as loose debris.

(b) was not aware of any operational manuals or asbestos reports associated with the building.

(b) believed the work occurred for about 3 days, and (b) (6), (b) was present during the work days and was giving orders to NPS employees.

(b) had no further information. Agents thanked (b) for his assistance and concluded the interview.

This document contains neither recommendations nor conclusions of the EPA.  
It is the property of the EPA and is loaned to your agency;  
it and its contents are not to be distributed outside your agency.